G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

File No. 70 1900.

Serial Nos. 1–4.

1900.

(Banking.)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1–4

~~Part~~ B for

Endorsed D. Narasimha Iyer

SUBJECT.

Recovery of Insurance premiums from G. Narasimha Iyengar, late School master at Seringapatam.

Sl 4. 71 1470-1570. dated 3.4.02 To D.C Mysore & the Secy to the Insurance Committee. Cl& States that in future, whenever an Official whose life has been insured, quits the Govt service for any reason whatever, the fact should be reported to the Secy to the Insurance Committee by the head of the Office Concerned. In the instance in question the Treasury Officer, whose name must be reported, has rendered himself liable to be censured by Govt.

W D 1351—GPB—20,000—18-12-13

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc.]

Letter No: 573 of 20th Janry: 1902 from the Dyscomm: Mysore re the recovery of Ins^e premium from G. Narasimha Iyngar.

G. Narasimha Iyngar holder of Policy No: 1001 was a School Master at Seringapatam. He resigned his appointment in 1897. This fact not having been reported to the Ins^e Secy. either by the official superior of the insured or by the Treasury Dept. the premium on his policy continued to be recovered. When however it was known in the Ins^e Office that the said Policy holder had ceased to be in service, the Dyscomm^r was requested in April 1900 not to recover any more premiums from the insured, in spite of which premium for June 1900 was recovered. Thereupon the Dyscomm^r was asked by the Ins^e Secy to explain why the premium was recovered contrary to the Ins^e Secy's instructions. This Explanation was not sent. // Why not?

In the meantime G. Narasimha Iyngar applied for permission to pay the premiums on his Policy once in six months. In granting the permission ~~applied~~ prayed for the Ins^e Committee noticed the irregularities and referred the matter to Govt, "in view to such orders being passed regarding the

N.B.—Should notes, etc., be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or the slips passed on this form.

/

's Amildar's conduct as to them
may seem proper"

The Dyfommr Rupore Dist:
was ~~reported~~ written to in this office N° 8797
of 3. 5. 01 to forward an Explanation
as to why the instructions of the Ins^{ll}
Secy were ~~dis~~ not attended to.

The Dyfommr in reply submits copies
of two dockets to his address from
the Treasury Officer and states that
the Treasury Dept was at fault
in the matter. He also states
that the Official to blame has
been fined. May a docket be
written to the Ins^{ll} Secretary
~~to~~ forwarding a copy of the
Rupore Dyfommr's letter under
reference together with the file
of papers received from the
Ins^{ll} Secretary with his N° 1836
23. 4. 01?

The Hon'ble
Submitted for orders.

N
4/3/02

Submitted
Draft N 6/3/02
Submitted to the Dewan
with a draft for
approval

7/3/1902

(vide Dewan's order on the
draft order sheet)

Why? What are the facts. The
process is defective

& the Treasury Officer
at fault left alone

N. B — Should notes, etc., be written on small slips the notes must be copied on the slips passed on this form.

MGCPB—20-7-1904-1000

3

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore.

Read:-

Letter No. 1836 dated the 3rd April 1901 from the Secretary to the Mysore State Life Ins. Committee bringing to the notice of Govt certain irregularities in the recovery of insurance premiums from G. Narasimha Iyengar, late School master at Seringapatam.

2. This Office No. 8797/7892 of the 3rd May 1901 to the Dy. Comr. Mysore Dist. calling for a report on the above.

3. Letter No. 573 of the 20th Janry. 1902 from the Dy. Comr. Mysore Dist. submitting the report called for.

Order thereon

G. Narasimha Iyengar holder of the Policy No. 1001 ceased to be in Govt Service in

3934

The Dy Comrs report it is the practice of the Treasurer to forward to the Accts. Genl the final bill when the last draft is received in the drawer under which the pension, retrenchment &c. is drawn. The necessary documents are kept in correspondence.

D.A. Agam 11.III.02

13/3

Draft submd for approl

15/3

15/3/02

in 1897. This was not reported to the Secy: Insce Commr, and in consequence the Policy holder continued to pay the premiums on his policy till Dec 1899, when the Insce Secy noticing the irregular payments of the premium by the policy holder called upon the Amildar to ~~intimate~~ report whether the said Policy holder continued to be in service, and if so; why the premiums were not regularly paid. The Amildar, in rep-ly reported that the policy holder was not in Govt service, but was practising as a Pleader. Thereupon the Insce Secy requested the Dy Commr in his No 1676 of the 5th April 1900, not to recover any more premiums from the said Policy holder, as he had ceased to be in Govt service and as he had not applied for permission under Insce Rules

Rules to continue to pay premiums on his Policy. Inspite of this request the premium was again recovered in the month of June 1900. The Insce Secy: again wrote to the Dy Commr calling upon him to intimate why the premium was recovered from the Policy holder contrary to the instructions conveyed in his letter of April 1900. No reply was sent to the Insce Secretary.

The provision contained in Rule 26 of the Insce Rules is clear and ought not to have been lost sight of in the case under notice. The initial mistake

mistake lay with the Amildar of Seringapatam Taluk, who, when he came to know that the School master had resigned his appointment, should have reported the matter to his official superior and solicited orders, and in the absence of sanction from the Instr Commrs ought not to have recovered any premium from the Official concerned. His procedure has been most irregular and the Dy Commr did not apparently take steps to rectify it even when his attention was drawn to it by the Secry: to the Instr Committee. The Amildar's Explanation ~~but~~ should be obtained and submitted for the orders of

7

of Govt.

In future, whenever an official whose life has been insured quits the Govt Service for any reason whatever, before the Policy in his favour has matured, the fact should be reported by the Secy: to the Insce Committee by the Head of the Office concerned.

Print

N Secretary

To 7/3/02

The Insce Secy: with Secs: to this No: read above

" Dy/Comrs ellypore Dist-

" Atten Dy/Comrs

" Heads of Depts.

RECEIVED

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
G.A. 7265
APR 26 1901
DEWAN

Submitted for orders
N.S
1.5.01

2129/109/1901

From

The Secretary to the
Mysore State Life
Insurance Committee,
Bangalore.

To The Secretary to the
Govt of Mysore
General & Rev: Depts

Dated 23 Bangalore
Despatched 25-
Received April 1901
General No. 1836
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file

Submitting a file of papers connected with the policy holden by 1001 G. Narasimiengar, who having resigned his service continued payment of premium without obtaining the Committee's permission to do so. The Treasury office has, in spite of instructions from this office, accepted a payment in June 1900. Though called upon to explain, the Amildar has not yet complied with the requisition

R
26/4/01

Dec 29/4/01 N.S.

Section

R29/4/01

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY TO THE MYSORE STATE LIFE INSURANCE COMMITTEE.

23rd April 1901 Bangalore

No. 1836 / 25
Qr 1 file

From

The Secretary to the Mysore State Life Insurance Committee, Bangalore.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments
Bangalore

Sir,

I am directed to submit the following for such orders as Government may deem proper.

(2) One G. Narasimmiengar holder of policy No. 1001 resigned his appointment of assistant master in the English School at Seringapatam in December 1897. which fact was neither reported by the head of the department in which the assured was employed nor by the Treasury Officer of Seringapatam who accepted

3

accepted payment of premium in arrears on the above policy contrary to Rule 24 of Mysore State Life Insurance.

(3) When it came to the Knowledge of this office in December 1899, the Treasury Officer of Seringapatam was requested not to accept payment of future premium in spite of which a payment was accepted in June 1900. Though called upon to explain the circumstances under which this office instructions were disregarded, the amildar has not yet complied with the requisition. The file of papers connected with the subject matter is herewith submitted and may be returned when no longer required.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedient Servant

Secretary Insurance Committee

4

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated ~~3/5/07~~
No. 8797
7892
Encl 1.

Section
File No
Serial No 2

In inviting his attention to the Insurance Secretary's docket No 367 dated the 22nd August last requesting to be informed ~~as to~~ why Insurance Premium had been recovered from the holder of the Insurance Policy No 1001, has the honour to forward herewith a copy of letter No 1836 dated the 23rd April 1901, from the Insurance Secy to this Office, complaining of certain irregularities that have occurred in the case and to request ~~that~~ an Early Explanation as to why the instructions conveyed to him by the Ins^l Secy: in his letter No 1676 of 5th April 1900, were not attended

attended to and why the GOVERNOR TOPINSON
same officer's subsequent letter
referred to above, was not duly
answered.

By order

Secretary.

draft
ns
2/5/07

Rev. C. records

Please put up the previous reference

283
1/2/02

6

3

938
1901-1902.

FROM

H. Ramanuja Iyengar Esquire
The Deputy Commissioner,
of the Mysore District.

To

A. Vebayimudaiyya Esqr B.A., B.L.
The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments

Dated 20th
Despatched 21 } January 1902.
Received

General No. 573
No.

Enclosure No. 2

Submits copies of certain dockets received from the Treasury Officer, Mysore District, in not taking steps to stop the recovery of premium from G. Narasimha Iyengar.

283
1/2/02

No. 5[th] 73.

Enclosures No. 2

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,

MYSORE DISTRICT.

Dated 20[th]/24 January 1902.

To N. V. Ekambundaiyya Esqr M. A., M. L.
The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

Sir,

Adverting to your docket etc 8797 F. 1892 dated 3rd May 1901 forwarding copy of Insurance Secretary's etc 1836 dated 23rd April 1901 and calling for an explanation of certain irregularities in connection with the recovery of premium from the holder of Policy etc 1001, I have the honor to submit herewith copies of the marginally noted dockets received from the Treasury Officer Mysore District from which it will be observed that the Treasury Department is at fault in not taking steps to stop the recovery of premium from G. Ekambara Simha Iyengar the official to blame has been fined.

No 39 dated 9-7-1901.
No. 239 dated 8-1-1902.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

For Offg Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

HPG

1901

From

The Treasury Officer
Mysore District

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated 9th
Despatched
Received 10 } July 1901.

General Ctr No 39

Enclosure No 1.

In returning herewith his memo No 6 dated 6th Instant forwarding in original Ctr No 31/769 dated 2nd July 1901 from the Secretary to the Government of Mysore Revenue and General Departments calling for some explanation in re the irregularity in connection with the recovery of premium from the policy holder Ctr No 1001 has the honor to state that a reference was made to the Secretary Insurance Committee for the return of this office memo No 970 dated 17th March 1901 with its enclosures and that a reminder also has been sent today to him. The reference will be disposed of

or soon after a reply is received from that officer.

To C Venkata Row
Treasury Officer
Mysore District.

Copy.

For Offg: Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

20-1-1902
Mysore

10 1902.

From

S. G. Padmanabha Iyengar Esqr B.A.
Treasury officer
Mysore District

To.

H. Ramanuja Iyengar Esqr
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.
Mysore

Dated 8th
~~Despatched~~ Despatched 9th
Received 9th
} January 1902.

General etc 239.

This office etc 39 dated 9th July last reporting that the Secretary's preference regarding the irregularity noticed in connection with the recovery of premium for June 1900 from one G. Narasimha Iyengar holder of Policy etc 1001 will be disposed of on receipt of certain records called for from the Secretary Insurance Committee.

Referring to the above has the honor

to inform that the Secretary has since intimated to this office that this office memo no 970 dated 17-3-1907 which contains the explanation of the Seringapatam Amildar was already forwarded by him to the Secretary Revenue and General Departments. On referring to the references and register available in this office the undersigned has observed that the premium in question was recovered and credited in the Seringapatam Taluk as no intimation was sent from the District Treasury on the wrong impression that the instruction of the Comptroller was only applicable to the District Treasury. Moreover no particular Taluk was noted in the Comptroller's docket on the subject.

Sd. S. G. Padmanabha Iyengar
Treasury Officer
Mysore District
Mysore

"Copy"

for Offg. Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

20-1-1902
Mysore.

12

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore.

Read:—

Letter No. 1836 dated the 3rd April 1901 from the Secy. to the Ins. Commr. bringing to the notice of Govt certain irregularities in the recovery of insurance premiums from G. Narasimha Iyengar, late School Master at Seringapatam.

2. This Office No. 8797 of H 892 the 3rd May 1901 to the Dy. Comr. Mysore District calling for a report on the above.

3. Letter No. 573 of the 20th Jany 1902, from the Dy. Comr. Mysore Dist. submitting the report called for.

Order thereon.

G.

Ex. No. ____

File No. ____

Serial No. 4

Re—

Draft for approval of the Dewan—

21/3/1902

Read 22.3.02 Mysore 3894.

Read H 26/3/02.

En file sent with P.P. 22/3/02

No. H 1470-1510 of 3/4/02

G. Narasimha Iyengar [redacted] a School Master at Seringapatam and holder of the Policy No 1001, ceased to be in Govt Service in 1897. This was not reported to the Secy: Ins Commr and in consequence the Policy holder continued to pay premiums on his Policy till Dec 1899, the premiums being recovered not by means of deductions from the pay of the insured which is the procedure prescribed in the case of the insured who continue to be in Govt Service, but by accepting money payments made irregularly. The Ins Secy: noticing the irregular payments, called upon the Amildar, in Dec 1899, to report whether the Policy holder continued to be in service and if so why the premiums were not regularly paid.

The

The Amildar, in reply, reported that the Policy holder was not in Govt Service but was practising as a Pleader. Thereupon the Insce Secy requested the Dysons in his No 1676 of the 5th April 1900, not to recover any more premiums from the said Policy holder, as he had ceased to be in Govt Service and as he had not applied for permission under Insce Rules to continue to pay premium on his Policy. In spite of this request, the premium was again recovered in June 1900. The Insce Secy again wrote to the Dysons calling upon him to intimate why the premium was recovered from the Policy holder contrary to the instructions conveyed

converged in his letter of April 1900. The reply was sent to the Ins^ce Secy:

Subsequently the Policy holder, G. Narasimha Iyengar applied to the Ins^ce Com^ee for permission to pay premiums on his Policy once in six months. In granting this request, the Ins^ce Comm^ee noticed the irregularities and referred the matter to Govt for orders. sr 6.3.01

The Dy Com^r was thereupon requested ~~written to, in this office docket read above~~ to explain why the instructions of the Ins^ce Secy: were not attended to. The Dy Com^r submits an Explanation from the Treasury Officer, who says that no intimation was sent from the District Treasury on the wrong impression that the instructions of the Comptroller were only applicable to the District Treasury. and that the name of Mr Talcik was not mentioned in the Communication from the Insurance Secy.

This

The Treasury Officers explanation is unsatisfactory. The No: of the Policy & the Name of the Policy-holders were given by the Insurance Co's. A reference to the State marks will from Talukas could & should have been made & the requisite instructions issued by the Amildar concerned.

~~This is not satisfactory.~~ The Dyson^a ~~also~~ admits that the Treasury Dept^t was at fault and ~~also~~ reports that the official to blame has been fined.

The provision contained in Rule 26 of the Ins^ce Rules is clear and ought not to have been lost sight of in the case under notice. The initial mistake lay with the Amildar of Seringapatam Taluk who when he came to know that the School master had resigned his appointment, should have reported the matter to his official superior and solicited orders, and, in the absence of sanction from the Ins^ce Comm^r ought not to have ~~received~~ received any premium from

from the official concerned. His procedure has been most irregular and the Dy Comr, did not apparently take steps to rectify it, Even when his attention was drawn to it by the Secy: to the Ins Commr. The Amildar's Explanation should be obtained and submitted for the orders of Govt.

In future, whenever an official whose life has been insured quits the Govt Service for any reason whatever, before the Policy in his favour has matured, the fact should be reported to the Secy: to the Ins Commr by the Head of the Office concerned — In the instance

in the Treasury Departt.

in future the Heads of Offices where sureties are taken should be reminded annually with the circular issued by Govt

22.III.02

Print

15/3/02 Secretary

To

The Ins Secy with Enc: this Govt. read above
Dy Comrs Bijapur Dist-
Dy Comrs of their Dists
Heads of Depts.

18

1901-1902

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL

PROCEEDINGS.

Dated 3rd April 1902

No. Fl. 1470-1510

Passing orders on certain irregularities brought to notice in connection with the recovery of Insurance premiums from G. Narasimha Iyengar, late schoolmaster at Seringapatam.

S.E.P.—11-4-02—200

READ—

Letter No. 1836, dated the 3rd April 1901, from the Secretary to the Insurance Committee, bringing to the notice of Government, certain irregularities in the recovery of insurance premiums from G. Narasimha Iyengar, late schoolmaster at Seringapatam.

2. This office No 8797—Fl. 892, dated the 3rd May 1901, to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, calling for a report on the above.

3. Letter No. 573, dated the 20th January 1902, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, submitting the report called for.

No. Fl-1470-1510, DATED BANGALORE, 3RD APRIL 1902.

ORDER THEREON.—G. Narasimha Iyengar, a schoolmaster at Seringapatam and holder of the Policy No. 1091, ceased to be in Government service in 1897. This was not reported to the Secretary, Insurance Committee, and in consequence the Policy-holder continued to pay premiums on his Policy till December 1899, the premiums being recovered not by means of deductions from the pay of the insured, which is the procedure prescribed in the case of the insured who continue to be in Government service, but by accepting money payments made irregularly. The Insurance Secretary, noticing the irregular payments, called upon the Amildar, in December 1899, to report whether the Policy-holder continued to be in service and if so, why the premiums were not regularly paid. The Amildar, in reply, reported that the Policy-holder was not in service but was practising as a Pleader. Thereupon the Insurance Secretary requested the Deputy Commissioner in his No. 1676, of the 5th April 1900, not to recover any more premiums from the said Policy-holder, as he had ceased to be in Government service and as he had not applied for permission under Insurance Rules to continue to pay premiums on his Policy. In spite of this request, the premium was again recovered in June 1900. The Insurance Secretary again wrote to the Deputy Commissioner calling upon him to intimate why the premium was recovered from the Policy-holder contrary to the instructions conveyed in his letter of April 1900. No reply was sent to the Insurance Secretary.

Subsequently, on 6th March 1901, the Policy-holder, G. Narasimha Iyengar, applied to the Insurance Committee for permission to pay premiums on his Policy once in six months. In granting this request, the Insurance Committee noticed the irregularities and referred the matter to Government for orders.

The Deputy Commissioner was thereupon requested to explain why the instructions of the Insurance Secretary were not attended to. The Deputy Commissioner submits an explanation from the Treasury Officer, who says that no intimation was sent from the District Treasury on the wrong impression that the instructions of the Comptroller were only applicable to the District Treasury and that the name of the taluk was not mentioned in the communication from the Insurance Secretary. The Treasury Officer's explanation is anything but satisfactory. The number of the Policy and the name of the Policy-holder were given by the Insurance Secretary. A reference to the statements received from taluks could and should have been made and the requisite instructions issued to the Amildar concerned. The Deputy Commissioner admits that the Treasury Department was at fault and reports that the official to blame has been fined.

The provision contained in Rule 26 of the Insurance Rules is clear and ought not to have been lost sight of in the case under notice. The initial mistake lay with the Amildar of Seringapatam Taluk, who, when he came to know that the schoolmaster had resigned his appointment, should have reported the matter to his official superior

and solicited orders, and, in the absence of sanction from the Insurance Committee, ought not to have recovered any premium from the official concerned. His procedure has been most irregular and the Deputy Commissioner in the Treasury Department did not apparently take steps to rectify it, even when his attention was drawn to it by the Secretary to the Insurance Committee. The Amildar's explanation should be obtained and submitted for the orders of Government.

In future, whenever an official whose life has been insured quits the Government service for any reason whatever before the Policy in his favor has matured, the fact should be reported to the Secretary to the Insurance Committee by the head of the office concerned. In the instance in question the Treasury Officer, whose name must be reported, has rendered himself liable to be censured by Government.

H. V. NANJUNDAYYA,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Insurance Secretary, with enclosure to his letter read above.
The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.
The Deputy-Commissioners of other Districts.
The Heads of Departments.

Exd.—C.V.